

## REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the telephone interview on March 21, 2007, in which the Levy reference and the Applicant's remarks in the Request for Continued Examination filed March 14, 2007, were discussed.

Regarding claim 2, Levy does not disclose and would not have suggested an authentication server for performing authentication when the user ID information and two or more URLs associated with a channel are sent from the portable terminal, and outputting the two or more URLs after performing the authentication, as recited in amended claim 2.

Although Levy discloses a user entering an URL to access an information retrieval system 10, the input URL in Levy is an URL pointing to the information retrieval system 10. After the user gains access to the system 10, the system 10 shows the user a list of information services that can be chosen by the user for delivery to the user's cell phone (col. 4, lines 43-52). In Levy, the URL pointing to the system 10 is one URL, two or more URLs that are associated with a channel.

Moreover, Levy does not disclose binding the gathered contents into a single channel, and transmitting the single channel of contents to the portable terminal, as recited in claim 2. Levy discloses an information retrieval system that allows the user to select from a list of information services, and to specify when and how the information is delivered. In Levy, each piece of information is treated separately, i.e., can have different delivery schedules and delivery destinations (col. 5, lines 5-13). Levy discloses an example of using a short message system to deliver the information (col. 4, lines 14-17). Each piece of information would be a separate short message. Even if the different short messages are sent to the same mobile device according to the same schedule, the different short messages are not bound into a single channel, as recited in claim 2.

Claims 7, 20, and 23 are patentable for at least similar reasons as those applied to claim 2.

All of the dependent claims are patentable for at least similar reasons as those applied to the claims on which they depend.

Applicant : Kazuho Oku  
Serial No. : 09/911,816  
Filed : July 24, 2001  
Page : 11 of 11

Attorney Docket: 13280-003001 / OPP 010431 US

Any circumstance in which the applicant has addressed certain comments of the examiner does not mean that the applicant concedes other comments of the examiner. Any circumstance in which the applicant has made arguments for the patentability of some claims does not mean that there are not other good reasons for patentability of those claims and other claims. Any circumstance in which the applicant has amended or canceled a claim does not mean that the applicant concedes any of the examiner's positions with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/12/2007

Rex I. Huang  
Rex I. Huang  
Reg. No. 57,661

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
225 Franklin Street  
Boston, MA 02110  
Telephone: (617) 542-5070  
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906